City of Lafayette Staff Report

For:	City Council
By:	Leah C. Greenblat, Transportation Planner
Date Written:	November 4, 2008
Meeting Date:	November 10, 2008
Subject:	Review and Comment on October 9, 2008 Draft Central County Action Plan

---

Introduction / Discussion

At its October 20, 2008 meeting, the Circulation Commission reviewed the Draft Central County Action Plan for Routes of Regional Significance, attached. The draft plan was prepared by TRANSPAC, the Contra Costa Transportation Authority's regional transportation planning committee. TRANSPAC includes central county jurisdictions to the north and east of Lafayette. The draft plan includes Routes of Regional Significance that directly link to Pleasant Hill Road in Lafayette. Since the draft plan was issued, staff has requested and TRANSPAC has agreed to extend its comment deadline to December. This allows enough time for the City of Lafayette to complete its review prior to SWAT reviewing the draft plan at its December meeting.

Staff prepared a report, attached, for the Commission which provided general background information on that plan's development and a table containing staff's comments on the draft plan. The Commission concurred with staff's comments and agreed to forward staff's comments and the Commission's additional comments to the City Council for its consideration. The Commission's additional comments included noting that streets which connect to Reliez Valley Road as well as Pleasant Hill Road require additional analysis and actions in order to address the impacts that are occurring from using these local roads as by-passes to the I-680/SR 24 interchange. The Commission also requested more specificity and clarity throughout the document.

The Commission generally concurred with staff that the draft plan's proposed actions and Multimodal Transportation Service Objectives (MTSOs) were not ambitious in terms of addressing downstream traffic impacts. Commissioner Hiden reported that according to a Contra Costa Times article, attached, the City of Concord is considering requiring one parking space per each dwelling unit bedroom due to their belief that the residents will continue to drive as often as they have been doing. The article explains that Concord city

11E

leaders also are contemplating this type of parking requirement in areas near BART. The Commission viewed this interest in increasing the parking requirements as another indicator of the TRANSPAC region's lack of effort in promoting alternatives to the single occupancy vehicle. The Commission desired that this information be incorporated into the comment letter to TRANSPAC. Staff prepared a draft comment letter, attached, to TRANSPAC incorporating the Commission's comments.

After having the opportunity to review the Draft Central County Action Plan, staff then compared its elements and organization to the Draft Lamorinda Action Plan. Based on that review, staff identified some suggested changes to the Draft Lamorinda Action Plan, see attached Commission staff report, in addition to the comments, attached, that were submitted previously. The Commission concurred with these comments and staff has incorporated them into a draft letter to SWAT and the Lamorinda Program Management Committee (LPMC), attached.

Fiscal Impact

None.

Recommendation

1. Forward comment letter regarding the Draft Central County Action Plan to TRANSPAC

2. Forward comment letter regarding the Draft Lamorinda Action Plan to SWAT and LPMC

Attachments

1. Draft City of Lafayette comment letter to Barbara Neustadter, TRANSPAC

2. Draft City of Lafayette comment letter to SWAT and LPMC

3. Excerpt of draft October 20, 2008 Circulation Commission meeting minutes

4. October 9, 2003 Draft of the Central County Action Plan for Routes of Regional Significance with transmittal letter

5. July 21, 2008 Second Draft Lamorinda Action Plan Update

6. September 23, 2008 City of Lafayette comment letter to Martin Engelmann, CCTA regarding the July 21, 2008 Draft Lamorinda Action Plan

7. "Concord contemplates changing parking standards for new neighborhoods," Contra Costa Times, October 14, 2008.

November 4, 2008

Barbara Neustadter,
TRANSPAC Manager
2300 contra Costa Boulevard, Ste. 360
Pleasant Hill, CA 94512

Dear Ms. Neustadter:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the October 9, 2008 Draft Central County Action Plan. The City of Lafayette's Circulation Commission discussed and reviewed the document and the City Council authorized sending this letter at its November 10, 2008 meeting.

We were pleased to see the inclusion of Multimodal Transportation Service Objectives (MTSOs) in the draft plan; however we would prefer more ambitious MTSOs in terms of addressing downstream traffic impacts on Pleasant Hill Road and Reliez Valley Road. The draft plan tends to focus more of its attention towards vehicles entering the TRANSPAC region, but not vehicles leaving TRANSPAC and entering the SWAT region.

A recent Contra Costa Times article suggests that the City of Concord is considering requiring one parking space per each dwelling unit bedroom due to their belief that the residents will continue to drive as often as they have been doing. The article explains that Concord city leaders also are contemplating this type of parking requirement in areas near BART. This Concord situation is an example of why we are concerned about downstream traffic impacts in Lafayette. We applaud TRANSPAC's effort to keep vehicles on Highway 4 and I-680 east of I-680. We would welcome that same commitment to move vehicles to I-680 rather than have them travel along roads parallel to and west of the I-680.

The table below contains the City of Lafayette's additional official comments on the draft Plan.

City of Lafayette Comments on Central County Action Plan, October 9, 2008 Draft			
Item	**Page**	**Subject**	**Comment**
1.	N/A	Concord Naval Weapons Station	While the development of this site is still in the planning stage, it is insufficient to relegate discussion of this large, known future development to several footnotes within the Plan. A discussion should be added explaining the future review process. For example, what will the City of Concord need to do to process the project in terms of the GMP for Measure J compliance?
2.	N/A	Evaluation of MTSOs contained in current Action Plan	The draft Plan lacks but should include an evaluation of past MTSOs contained in the current Action Plan.
3.	Page 2	Figure 1-1	Enlarge Figure 1-1 to a legible size. The map and legend should be usable if copied in black and white and not just color.
4.	Page 5	Land Use and Transportation Trends	The draft Plan contains no presentation of the analysis of the past MTSOs (or TSOs) contained in 2000 Update of the Central County Action Plan. The Plan also contains no forecasts of the MTSOs values contained in the draft Plan. Without this information, trends and changes on specific routes cannot be sufficiently monitored. For example, on page 20 of the draft Lamorinda Action Plan, Table 6 summarizes past, present and future MTSOs.
5.	Page 7	Table 2-2	Thank you for including the actual predicted growth figures. The percentages provided have the potential to mislead the reader into comparing the percent change from region to region which wouldn't be accurate. For example, Central County experienced an increase of 9000 jobs or a 5% increase in the total number of Central County jobs. Lamorinda also experienced a 5% increase, but it only had 1000 new jobs. Since the "% Change" is provided in the table, add a note of explanation to avoid this likely

City of Lafayette Comments on Central County Action Plan, October 9, 2008 Draft			
Item	**Page**	**Subject**	**Comment**
			confusion.
6.	Page 8	Expected growth in senior population	The growth in senior population is identified as a growing trend, but no direct analysis is included on the possible transportation impacts of this trend. Chapter 4 does not identify this as an issue, objective or an item needing an action. Develop actions to incorporate and address this trend.
7.	Page 9	Figures 2-1 & 2-2	These Figures cite their sources at the "CCTA Countywide Travel Demand Model, 2008." Does this model include ABAG's recent shift in housing allocations?
8.	Page 10	Appendix C	Appendix C was not included in the document on TRANSPAC's website. Appendix C should be made available and the main body of the draft Plan should include summaries describing the content and trends contained in Appendix C.
9.	Page 10	Figure 2-3	Why were only "Key Roadways" included in this figure? What criteria were used to select Key Roadways? The information presented in this figure is of importance for all Routes of Regional Significance and it should be presented in the draft Plan. Enlarge figure so street names are legible. Add Pleasant Hill Road as a Key Roadway and identify the peak direction of travel for each Key Roadway.
10.	Page 11	Data Source	Cite the source of the information presented in the first sentence: Traffic demand in "…Central Contra Costa is projected to increase by about 30 percent."
11.	Pages 13, 16 & 17	East-Central Traffic Management Plan and the Central Contra Costa	These documents should be made available on the TRANSPAC website. How do these two documents differ? Are Alhambra Avenue, Geary Road, Pleasant Hill Road, and Taylor

City of Lafayette Comments on Central County Action Plan, October 9, 2008 Draft			
Item	**Page**	**Subject**	**Comment**
		Traffic Management Program	Blvd. included in these plans?
12.	Page 22	Goal 5	Jurisdictions need to determine the future capacity of the BART system before counting on BART as a means of commuting. What analysis has occurred to determine that adequate transit capacity exists?
13.	Page 26	Paragraph 1	If "TRANSPAC will continue to work closely with neighboring RTPCs…on shared Regional Routes" then further coordination is required to bring consistency with the Lamorinda Action Plan's MTSOs for PHR and the Central County Action Plan's MTSOs on routes linking to PHR in Lafayette.
14.	Page 33	MTSOs	We are not aware of other MTSOs that change by jurisdiction boundary. This may be okay and help a jurisdiction maintain its unique character. But a consistent methodology for corridor-wide analysis is still needed. What type of coordination will be necessary to comprehensively evaluate each Route of Regional Significance? Given the exceptionally low thresholds of these MTSOs, how will decision makers gauge the impacts of their land use decisions on regional routes?
15.	Page 35	Alhambra Ave.	What actions were considered and why were they not included to discourage the use of Alhambra Ave. as a shortcut to SR 24 via PHR and Reliez Valley Road? If not already included, expand the existing Traffic Management Program to Geary, Taylor and Alhambra to encourage delay in order to discourage use of westbound/southbound traffic using PHR and Reliez Valley Road to by-pass the I-680/SR 24 interchange. Drivers from SR-4 also use these routes

City of Lafayette Comments on Central County Action Plan, October 9, 2008 Draft			
Item	**Page**	**Subject**	**Comment**
			to by-pass the I-680/SR 24 interchange. Why are no MTSOs identified for the portion of the roadway in Pleasant Hill?
16.	Page 38	Geary Road	If not already included, expand the existing Traffic Management Program to Geary, Taylor and Alhambra to encourage delay in order to discourage use of westbound/southbound traffic using PHR and Reliez Valley Road to by-pass the I-680/SR 24 interchange. Why are no MTSOs identified for the portion of the roadway in Pleasant Hill?
17.	Page 41	Pleasant Hill Road	Because two schools directly abut PHR in Lafayette, pedestrian and bicycle access and safety are primary concerns that would need to be addressed in any traffic management plan. The sentence in the Actions and Responsibilities bullet is incomplete. State what other elements were considered. Why are no MTSOs identified for the portion of the roadway in Walnut Creek and the County?
18.	Page 42	Taylor Blvd.	If not already included, expand the existing Traffic Management Program to Geary, Taylor and Alhambra to encourage delay in order to discourage use of westbound/southbound traffic using PHR and Reliez Valley Road to by-pass the I-680/SR 24 interchange. Why are no MTSOs identified for the portion of the roadway in the County?
19.	Page 48	TRANSPAC Traffic Mitigation	Paragraphs 1 and 2 state that the developer mitigates the impacts of "both the sponsoring jurisdiction and other affected jurisdictions." Lafayette is a

City of Lafayette Comments on Central County Action Plan, October 9, 2008 Draft			
Item	**Page**	**Subject**	**Comment**
		Program	jurisdiction that abuts and is downstream of TRANSPAC. Staff is not aware of any existing agreement between Lafayette and TRANSPAC to address traffic impacts from outside of the Lafayette. Clarify if such an agreement exists and provide an example of an impact to a downstream, non-TRANSPAC jurisdiction that TRANSPAC's fee program has mitigated.
20.	Page 51 & 54	Table 5-1: Pleasant Hill Rd. Improvement Project, Phases iii, iv, v	Please provide a project description of this project and revise the project name to clearly incorporate the scope of the project.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the Draft Central County Action Plan. If you have any questions regarding these comments, please contact Leah Greenblat, Transportation Planner, at 925.299.3229.

Thank you again for seeking our input.

Sincerely,

Mike Anderson
Mayor

Enclosure
cc: SWAT
Circulation Commission
Martin Engelmann

November 4, 2008

SWAT
c/o Andy Dillard
Town of Danville
510 La Gonda Way
Danville, CA 94526

LPMC
c/o Calvin Wong
Town of Moraga
PO Box 188
Moraga, CA 94556

Dear: LPMC and SWAT members

The City of Lafayette's Circulation Commission and City Council have both reviewed the Draft Central County Action Plan for Routes of Regional Significance. The Lafayette City Council agreed on November 10, 2008 to forward a comment letter, attached, directly to TRANSPAC. We hope that SWAT will consider concurring with our comments when forwarding its own comments to TRANSPAC.

After having the opportunity to review the Draft Central County Action Plan, we have identified some additional comments to the Draft Lamorinda Action Plan. We hope that SWAT will agree to have these comments addressed in the Draft Lamorinda Action Plan prior to agreeing to release that document.

Additional City of Lafayette Comments on the Draft Lamorinda Action Plan		
Item	**Page #**	**Comment**
1.	Page 7	Incorporate an explanation about Delay Index similar to the Central County Action Plan: A Delay Index of 1.0 indicates that the traffic moves at free flow speed unconstrained by congestion and not exceeding the posted speed limit. As congestion increases and average speed decreases, the Delay Index rises. A Delay Index of 2.0 indicates that the trip takes twice as long during peak hours as during the off-peak.
2.	Page 17-18, Tables 2-4	Incorporate intermediate years 2010 and 2020 into the table presenting demographic forecast data.
3.	Page 18-19, Figure 9 & 19	Graph is unclear. It should include separate bars for 2007, 2010, 2020 and 2030 growth.
4.	Page 21-28	The material presented in Chapter 5 would benefit from re-formatting and re-organization so that the chapter holds together as a comprehensive and clear unit. The draft Central County plan more clearly and holistically relates its goals to the broad actions it wishes to address (Chapter 3 and 4). Similar clarity in presentation and organization might benefit the Lamorinda Action Plan.
5.	Page 22, Table 7	Support transit service that links Lamorinda bus service more directly to communities to the north and east of Lafayette.
6.	Page 22, Table 7	Promote alternative work opportunities including employer pre-tax benefit programs, compressed work-week schedules, flex schedules and tele-work.
7.	Page 22, Table 7	In cooperation with Lamorinda jurisdictions, develop TDM plans and provide consultations to improve mobility and decreased parking demand for new development and redevelopment.
8.	Page 22, Table 7	Seek funding to provide bicycle parking infrastructure at employment sites and activity centers throughout Lamorinda.
9.	Page 22, Table 7	Encourage "green" commuting, including ZEV and NEV vehicles, clean fuel infrastructure and car-sharing.
10.	Page 23,	Work with TRANSPAC to develop a traffic management program to encourage delay in order to discourage use of westbound/southbound

Additional City of Lafayette Comments on the Draft Lamorinda Action Plan		
Item	**Page #**	**Comment**
	Table 9	traffic using PHR to by-pass the I-680/SR24 interchange.

Thank you for the opportunity to share our additional comments with you following our review of the draft Central County Action Plan. If you have any questions regarding these comments, please contact Leah Greenblat, Transportation Planner, at 925.299.3229.

Thank you again for seeking our input.

Sincerely,

Mike Anderson
Mayor

Enclosure
cc: Martin Engelmann, CCTA
Circulation Commission
Councilmember Tatzin
Leah Greenblat

DRAFT

City of Lafayette
Circulation Commission Regular Meeting
Draft Minutes

Lafayette Community Center
Lafayette, CA

October 20, 2008
7:00 PM

1. Call to Order Chair Ross called the meeting to order at 7:05 PM.

2. Roll Call

Present: Chair Ross, Vice Chair Hughes, Commissioners Hiden, Holit, Sevilla, and Wood

Absent: Commissioner Poling (excused)

BPAC: Bart Carr

Staff: Ms. Leah Greenblat, Transportation Planner; Mr. Chuck DeLeuw, Consulting Traffic Engineer; Ms. Marie Pettersen, Contract Minutes Taker

3. Adoption of the Agenda

Commissioner Wood moved and Vice Chair Hughes seconded to adopt the agenda as submitted. The motion was approved by unanimous voice vote.

4. Public Comments

There was no public comment on any item not on the agenda.

5. New Business

a. Review the Draft Central County Action Plan for Routes of Regional Significance

Ms. Greenblat explained that the Central County Action Plan is the equivalent of the Lamorinda Action Plan. The CCTA is in the process of updating all action plans for all regional planning committees. The draft of the Central County Action Plan (Pleasant Hill, Walnut Creek, Concord - areas north and east of Lafayette) encompasses areas that feed into Lafayette. One route of regional significance in the plan is Pleasant Hill Road. Staff has reviewed the draft plan. There have been some delays in circulating this plan because of some concerns with CCTA requirements. Some jurisdictions did not want to include Multimodal Transportation Service Objectives in their plan despite the CCTA's requirement to do so. These jurisdictions finally agreed to include MTSOs into their plan so now it is being circulated.

The Commission was handed out comments emailed from Commissioner Hiden.

Commissioner Hiden said that staff's comments were very good. Jurisdictions included roads that not routes of regional significance and suggested adding Reliez Valley Road (Item 12, pages 4 and 5, and Item 13, page 5 in Commissioner Hiden's email). She wondered if they were asking for trouble by adding this route.

Ms. Greenblat answered that the Transpac Action Plan identifies as one of its goals that it wants to keep traffic off local streets. Reliez Valley Road is not considered a major arterial. In the Lamorinda Action Plan it does talk about keeping traffic away from those streets. If the Commission wished to add Reliez Valley Road, it could be added as an additional comment noting that the Transpac Action Plan needs to develop actions to try to discourage traffic away from Reliez Valley Road.

Ms. Greenblat said staff would add a new comment noting Reliez Valley Road specifically.

Commissioner Hiden asked if staff had counts for Reliez Valley Road.

Ms. Greenblat answered yes, that staff had up-to-date counts.

Commissioner Hiden asked if they could delay the Transpac Action Plan until Concord had finished dealing with their parking ordinance and the Naval Weapons Station.

Ms. Greenblat replied no, as this was not in their General Plan yet, and it would be years before there was a draft plan for the Naval Weapons Station. She was not familiar with the parking issue but the Commission would need to make a very good case to delay the plan on that basis. Staff could include this in the introduction in their comments that Concord is not working sufficiently to manage their transportation impacts.

The Commission discussed Commissioner Hiden's comments from her email which referred to the comments in the staff report.

Item 5, Page 3: The Commission agreed to suggest that actions be developed to accommodate the increase in senior travelers who will not be riding bicycles.

Item 9, Page 4: The Commission did not agree with Commissioner Hiden's comment on this item.

Item 10, Page 4: The Commission agreed to request inclusion of the map.

Item 14, Page 5: The Commission agreed to request a listing of the elements that were considered.

Item 15, Page 5: This will be handled under the new comment to be added by staff on Reliez Valley Road.

The following comments were also provided by Commissioner Hiden on the Central County Action Plan for Routes of Regional Significance (Attachment 1 of the agenda packet).

Chapter 1, Page 2: The Commission agreed to request a full-page map in color.

Chapter 2, Pages 1, 2, 3, and 4: The Commission did not agree with Commissioner Hiden's comments.

Chapter 2, Page 4: The Commission did not agree to add the word "percentages" after "population."

Chapter 2, Page 5: The Commission agreed to add this question to the staff matrix: Has this model factored in ABAG's recent shift in housing allocations?"

Chapter 2, Page 6 and Chapter 3, Page 1: The Commission did not agree to these comments.

Chapter 3, Page 11: The Commission agreed to add this as a general comment: "The jurisdictions need to determine the capacity of the BART system before counting on it to spare them their commuter woes."

Chapter 4, Page 2: The Commission discussed this comment regarding MTSOs and agreed to include a comment that the Transpac MTSOs should be consistent with the MTSOs on PHR. The Transpac plan should also include a similar analysis of past and future MTSOs like what is included on page 20 of the Draft Lamorinda Action Plan.

Chapter 4, Page 2, Paragraph 3: In response to Commissioner Hiden's question where it was accurate that the Authority has decided to require GPA review noticing a high level of 500 new peak hour vehicle trips, Ms. Greenblat replied yes, this was accurate. The Commission did not agree to the rest of Commissioner Hiden's comments on this paragraph.

Chapter 5, Pages 2 and 5: Ms. Greenblat did not think they were referring to the widening of Pleasant Hill Road through Lafayette and removal of the Acalanes hump, but that she would check into this further.

Under the Transpac Regional Transportation Mitigation Program (RTMP), Commissioner Hiden had the following comments:

Item 3: The Commission did not agree to this comment.

Chapter 6, Paragraph 1, Lines 6 and 7: The Commission did not agree to this comment.

Attachment 2: Ms. Greenblat advised that the letter from Lafayette had already been sent to the CCTA and therefore there could be no changes to the letter.

Mr. DeLeuw said that in Figure 2.3 it should be noted whether this was a north or south direction.

Ms. Greenblat said she would incorporate the Commission's comments with staff's comments and forward them to Council at their first meeting in November. From there, Lafayette's comments would be forwarded to the Regional Transportation Planning Committee.

Commissioner Wood asked about the population forecast on page 18 of the DKS Associates' report.

Ms. Greenblat said that these figures were not yet in the Lafayette's General Plan. To ensure consistency with the Lamorinda Action Plan, any change in the General Plan would have to go before SWAT and the Lamorinda Action Committee.

Commissioner Wood moved and Vice Chair Hughes seconded to forward staff's comments along with the Commission's comments to Council. The motion was approved by unanimous voice vote.

6. Consent Calendar

a. Minutes of October 6, 2008

Commissioner Sevilla moved and Vice Chair Hughes seconded approval of the Consent Calendar as submitted. The motion was approved by unanimous voice vote.

7. Staff Reports

a. Update on Recent Council Actions

Ms. Greenblat reported Council agreed with and included all the Commission's recommendations and forwarded them in the comments letter to the CCTA on Issues and Options.

Vice Chair Hughes asked for a representative from the Commission to attend the next Downtown Strategic Plan meeting on November 5 at 7PM, as he was unable to attend. Commissioner Hiden volunteered to attend.

8. Adjournment